

## 5 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED DISCUSSIONS

This section discusses growth-inducing impacts, irreversible environmental impacts, and energy impacts that would be caused by the project.

### 5.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Section 15126(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires a discussion of a proposed project's potential to foster economic or population growth, including ways in which a project could remove an obstacle to growth. Growth does not necessarily create significant physical changes to the environment. However, depending upon the type, magnitude, and location of growth, it can result in significant adverse environmental effects. The proposed project's growth inducing potential is therefore considered significant if it could result in significant physical effects in one or more environmental issue areas.

#### 5.1.1 Population Growth

The proposed project would add up to 780 residential units in Downtown Long Beach. The current population of Long Beach is 472,779 and the City has approximately 2.82 persons per household (California Department of Finance, 2015). Development of the proposed project would therefore add an estimated 2,200 residents (780 dwelling units x 2.82 people/dwelling unit), thus increasing the City's population to 474,979. The Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) population growth forecast for Long Beach is 491,000 in 2020 and 534,100 in 2035 (SCAG RTP-SCS, 2012a). According to the City's General Plan Housing Element, realization of future housing development potential (7,270 new dwelling units by 2021) would result in an increase in the City's population of 20,501 persons, for a total population of 490,793 in 2021. Consequently, the population increase generated by the proposed project would not exceed SCAG or City of Long Beach citywide population forecasts.

As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, planned and pending development within the City would add approximately 1,187 new residential units to the City. Based on the estimate of 2.82 persons per household, cumulative development within the City (including the proposed project) would add 5,547 people (1,187 units x 2.82 people/unit + 2,200 residents for proposed project) bringing the total population to 478,326 (472,779 + 5,547). This would not exceed SCAG's 2020 population projection for Long Beach of 491,000 or the Long Beach General Plan Housing Element's population projection of 490,793 by 2021.

#### 5.1.2 Economic Growth

The project would generate temporary employment opportunities during construction, which would be expected to draw workers from the existing regional work force. Therefore, construction of the project would not be considered growth-inducing from a temporary employment standpoint.

The proposed project involves 240,000 gross square feet (gsf) of office space for the Port Building, 270,000 gsf of office space for City Hall staff and elected officials, a new 92,000 gsf library, 32,000 gsf of retail space, 8,000 gsf of restaurant space, and an estimated 290,400 gsf for a 200-room hotel. Of these uses, the retail space, restaurant space, and hotel would generate new



jobs. The Port Building, City Hall, and library would accommodate existing jobs that would be relocated to the new facilities. Table 5-1 shows the estimated jobs generated by the other proposed uses.

**Table 5-1  
 New Employees Accommodated by Proposed Project**

Land Use	Area (sf)	Area (acres)	Employees per Acre	Total Employees
Retail	32,000	0.73	18.86	14
Restaurant <sup>1</sup>	8,000	0.18	25.76	5
Hotel	290,400	6.67	51.91	346
<b>Total</b>				<b>365</b>

*Source: Table C-1, Range of Employment Densities (Employees Per Acre) by County (Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Employment Density Study Summary Report, October 31, 2001).*

<sup>1</sup> Employee rate for "Other Retail/Services" in SCAG Table C-1 was used, as "Restaurant" is not listed.

The proposed project would generate an estimated 2,200 new residents and 365 new jobs in Long Beach. This would contribute to economic growth. The additional population would likely contribute to the local economy as demand for general goods increases, which in turn could result in economic growth for various sectors. Nevertheless, the proposed project would not be expected to induce economic expansion to the extent that significant environmental impacts directly associated with the project's contribution would occur.

The Southern California Association of Government estimated employment (jobs) in the City to be 168,100 in 2008. SCAG's employment growth forecast for Long Beach is 176,000 in 2020 and 184,800 in 2035 (SCAG, 2012a). Therefore, jobs are expected to increase in the City by approximately 7,900 between 2008 and 2020 and approximately 16,700 between 2008 and 2035. Consequently, the employment increase generated by the proposed project would account for approximately 4.6 percent of job growth between 2008 and 2020 and would not exceed SCAG employment forecasts.

### **5.1.3 Removal of Obstacles to Growth**

The project site is located in a fully urbanized area that is well served by existing infrastructure. Existing utilities in Long Beach would be adequate to serve the proposed project. The project would be served by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD), with wastewater going to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plan (JWPCP). The JWPCP has the capacity to treat 400 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently processes an average flow of ~~263.4~~263.1 mgd (LACSD, ~~May 14~~September 23, 2015 NOP-NOA Response; see ~~Appendix A~~Section 8.0, *Response to Comments*). This existing wastewater infrastructure would be adequate to serve the proposed project and no capacity expansion would be necessary. Potable water is served by the Long Beach Water Department. As discussed in Section XVII, *Utilities and Service Systems*, and IX, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Initial Study, the proposed project is well served by existing infrastructure. The existing infrastructure would be adequate and no capacity expansion would be necessary to serve the project.



The proposed project would include the extension of Chestnut Avenue and Cedar Avenue through the project site. However, these roads would connect existing roads in an urban environment and would not provide for any substantial capacity increasing transportation or circulation improvements. Because the project constitutes redevelopment within an urbanized area and does not require the extension of new infrastructure through undeveloped areas, project implementation would not remove an obstacle to growth.

## 5.2 IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The *CEQA Guidelines* require that EIRs evaluating projects involving amendments to public plans, ordinances, or policies contain a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes. CEQA also requires decision makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve a project. This section addresses non-renewable resources, the commitment of future generations to the proposed uses, and irreversible impacts associated with the proposed project.

The proposed project would redevelop an urban area within the City of Long Beach. No previously undeveloped land would be converted for the project. Construction and operation of the project would irreversibly commit construction materials and non-renewable energy resources. The project would involve the use of building materials and energy, some of which are non-renewable resources. Consumption of these resources would occur with any development in the region and are not unique to the project. The increased intensity of residential, office, and commercial development would also irreversibly increase local demand for non-renewable energy resources such as petroleum products and natural gas. However, increasingly efficient building design and automobile engines are expected to offset this demand to some degree. In addition, the proposed project would be subject to the energy conservation requirements of the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, *California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings*) and the California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). The California Energy Code provides energy conservation standards for all new and renovated commercial and residential buildings constructed in California. The project is required to exceed Title 24 standards that are in effect at the time of development by 20 percent and to achieve a 25 percent reduction in electricity use through such measures as photovoltaic cells in compliance with Downtown Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-2.

The project would require a commitment of law enforcement, fire protection, water supply, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal services. However, as discussed in Section XIV, *Public Services*, and Section XVII, *Utilities and Service Systems* of the Initial Study, impacts to these service systems would be less than significant.

Primary impacts related to consumption of non-renewable and slowly renewable resources would be less than significant because the proposed project would not use unusual amounts of energy or construction materials, as development would be primarily comprised of residential uses, office space, and retail space. Consumption of these resources would occur with any development in the region and are not unique to the proposed project. Additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would incrementally increase local traffic and regional air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions as discussed in Sections 4.2, *Air Quality*, Section 4.4, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and Section 4.6, *Transportation and Traffic*. Impacts resulting from



traffic generated by future development would be less than significant or would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The project would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts previously identified in the Downtown Plan EIR. The Downtown Plan EIR determined that operational emissions associated with buildout of the Downtown Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Operation of the project would generate reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions that would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) operational significance thresholds and contribute to this impact. In addition, the Downtown Plan EIR determined that implementation of the Downtown Plan could result in exposure of receptors to short- and long-term emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) from onsite and offsite stationary and mobile sources; this impact was determined by the Downtown Plan EIR to be significant and unavoidable. The project would place residential uses within the Downtown Plan Area, contributing to this significant and unavoidable impact. Furthermore, the Downtown Plan EIR determined that implementation of the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. As development of the project site was anticipated in the Downtown Plan EIR, the project would contribute to the Downtown Plan's cumulative air quality impacts and would be significant and unavoidable.

The project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources. Construction of the project would involve the demolition of the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex, which have been identified as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Demolition of these buildings would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impact identified in the Downtown Plan EIR.

Lastly, construction activities associated with the project would generate noise that could exceed City of Long Beach standards at existing receptors; this impact would be significant and unavoidable. In addition, construction activities could subject nearby residents to excessive levels of ground-borne vibration. The Downtown Plan EIR and Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project Draft EIR determined that impacts related to construction-generated vibration would be significant and unavoidable. The project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impact identified by the Downtown Plan EIR.

### **5.3 ENERGY EFFECTS**

The *CEQA Guidelines* Appendix F requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy consumption and/or conservation impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The proposed project would involve the use of energy during the construction and operational phases of the project. Energy use during the construction phase would be in the form of fuel consumption (e.g., gasoline and diesel fuel) to operate heavy equipment, light-duty vehicles, machinery, and generators for lighting. In addition, temporary grid power may also be provided to any temporary construction trailers or electric construction equipment. Long-term operation of the proposed project would require permanent grid connections for electricity and natural gas service to power internal and exterior building lighting, and heating and cooling systems. In addition, the increase in vehicle trips associated with the project would increase fuel consumption within the City.



Electricity service for the proposed project would be provided by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE’s power mix consists of approximately 20 percent renewable energy sources (wind, geothermal, solar, small hydro, and biomass) (SCE website, 2015). Gas service would be provided by the Long Beach Gas and Oil Department.

California used 296,628 gigawatt-hours (GWh) of electricity in 2013 (CEC, 2014a) and 2,313 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 2012 (CEC, 2012). Californians presently consume over 18 billion gallons of motor vehicle fuels per year (CEC, 2014b).

The proposed project’s estimated motor vehicle fuel use is detailed in Table 5-2.

**Table 5-2  
 Estimated Project-Related Annual Motor Vehicle Fuel Consumption**

Vehicle Type	Percent of Vehicle Trips <sup>1</sup>	Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled <sup>2</sup>	Average Fuel Economy (miles/gallon) <sup>3</sup>	Total Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
<b>Existing</b>				
Passenger Cars	51.45%	7,337,324	27.5	266,812
Light/Medium Trucks	44.45%	6,339,048	23.5	269,747
Heavy Trucks/Other	3.67%	523,381	7.7	67,972
Motorcycles	0.43%	61,381	50	1,228
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14,261,076</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>605,759</b>
<b>With Project</b>				
Passenger Cars	50.46%	16,660,171	27.5	605,824
Light/Medium Trucks	44.89%	14,821,146	23.5	630,687
Heavy Trucks/Other	4.22%	1,393,300	7.7	180,948
Motorcycles	0.43%	141,971	50	2,839
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33,016,588</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>1,420,298</b>
<b>Net Change</b>				
Passenger Cars		9,322,847	27.5	339,012
Light/Medium Trucks		8,482,098	23.5	360,940
Heavy Trucks/Other		869,919	7.7	112,976
Motorcycles		80,590	50	1,611
<b>Total Net Change</b>		<b>18,755,512</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>814,539</b>

<sup>1</sup> Percent of vehicle trips found in Table 4.3 “Trip Type Information” in CalEEMod output (see Appendix B)

<sup>2</sup> Mitigated annual VMT found in Table 4.2 “Trip Summary Information” in CalEEMod output (see Appendix B)

<sup>3</sup> Average fuel economy provided by the United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2010).

Total estimated energy usage, including motor vehicle fuel, calculated using CalEEMod and shown in CalEEMod output files in Appendix B, is summarized and compared to state-wide usage in Table 5-3. Final energy use is shown as a net increase over the energy use from the existing use of the project site. The proposed project would make a minimal contribution to state-wide energy consumption in these categories.



**Table 5-3  
 Estimated Project-Related Energy Usage  
 Compared to State-Wide Energy Usage**

Form of Energy	Units	Annual Project-Related Energy Use	Annual State-Wide Energy Use	Project % of State-Wide Energy Use
<b>Existing</b>				
Electricity	megawatts per hour	6,830 <sup>1</sup>	296,628,000 <sup>2</sup>	0.0002%
Natural Gas	billion BTU	5.69 <sup>1</sup>	2,313,000 <sup>3</sup>	0.000002%
Motor Vehicle Fuels	gallons	605,759 <sup>4</sup>	18,019,000,000 <sup>5</sup>	0.00003%
<b>Proposed Project</b>				
Electricity	megawatts per hour	10,637	296,628,000	0.00004%
Natural Gas	billion BTU	23.88	2,313,000	0.00001%
Motor Vehicle Fuels	gallons	1,420,298	18,019,000,000	0.00008%
<b>Net Change</b>				
Electricity	megawatts per hour	3,807	296,628,000	0.00001%
Natural Gas	billion BTU	18.19	2,313,000	0.000008%
Motor Vehicle Fuel	gallons	814,539	18,019,000,000	0.00005%

<sup>1</sup> CalEEMod output provided in the Air Quality Analysis (see Appendix C for calculation results); Table 5.2

<sup>2</sup> California Energy Commission, California Energy Almanac, 2013 Total Electricity System Power, data as of September 2014. Available: [http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/electricity/total\\_system\\_power.html](http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/electricity/total_system_power.html)

<sup>3</sup> California Energy Commission, California Energy Almanac, Overview of Natural Gas in California – Natural Gas Supply. Available: <http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/naturalgas/overview.html>

<sup>4</sup> See Table 5-2

<sup>5</sup> California Energy Commission, 2014 Integrated Energy Policy Report, Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2014publications/CEC-100-2014-001/CEC-100-2014-001-CMF.pdf>.

The proposed project would also be subject to the energy conservation requirements of the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, *California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings*) and the California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). The California Energy Code provides energy conservation standards for all new and renovated commercial and residential buildings constructed in California. The Code applies to the building envelope, space-conditioning systems, and water-heating and lighting systems of buildings and appliances. The Code provides guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation. Minimum efficiency standards are given for a variety of building elements, including appliances; water and space heating and cooling equipment; and insulation for doors, pipes, walls and ceilings. The Code emphasizes saving energy at peak periods and seasons, and improving the quality of installation of energy efficiency measures. The California Green Building Standards Code sets targets for: energy efficiency; water consumption; dual plumbing systems for potable and recyclable water; diversion of construction waste from landfills, and use of environmentally sensitive materials in construction and design, including ecofriendly flooring, carpeting, paint, coatings, thermal insulation, and acoustical wall and ceiling panels.



The project is required to exceed Title 24 standards that are in effect at the time of development by 20 percent and to achieve a 25 percent reduction in electricity use through such measures as photovoltaic cells in compliance with Downtown Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-2. Exceedance of Title 24 energy conservation requirements would ensure that energy is not used in an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary manner.

## 5.4 PUBLIC HEALTH HAZARDS

An SEIR scoping meeting was held on April 30, 2015 to solicit further public comment on the scope and content of the SEIR. One commenter expressed concern that the project's proposed demolition could result in vermin from the existing buildings invading adjacent properties. Demolition could potentially disturb vermin in existing buildings, which, if substantial, could pose a public health hazard. The commenter suggested mitigation requiring existing buildings to be fumigated prior to demolition.

**Mitigation Measures.** The following mitigation measure would reduce potential public health impacts from vermin due to proposed demolition to a less than significant level.

**Other-1 Fumigation.** Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the project applicant shall fumigate all buildings.

**Significance After Mitigation.** Implementation of Mitigation Measure Other-1 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.



*This page intentionally left blank.*

